

Humanist

World Digest

VOL. 24, No. 2
MAY, 1952

1011 Heinz Avenue
BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA

COPY 25c
\$1.00 A YEAR

The Crisis of Civilization

By Franz Wertgen

Fear --- The Offspring of Orthodoxy

By William O. Douglas

THE PEOPLE TALK BACK

By John Morris

THE FREE CHURCH AND DEMOCRACY

By Phyllis Martin

PROBLEMS OF COOPERATIVE FARMING IN THE FAR EAST

By Sir Roger Thomas, C.I.E.

THE STATE OF LIBERTY

By Edward L. Ericson

POINTS OF VIEW - LETTERS TO EDITOR

THE IDEAL OF HUMANISM

We are seeking to present Humanism as a religious philosophy which denies no particular faith, but which provides a path over which all people can travel toward a unity that rises above the barriers of the beliefs which divide them. In behalf of this common faith, we emphasize a constructive approach rather than opposition to traditional philosophies.

1 CENT 1

TEN AIMS OF HUMANIST (World) FELLOWSHIP

- 1—Full endorsement of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations at the Plenary meeting December 10, 1948, and world-wide implementation and fulfilment of those rights at the earliest possible moment.
- 2—The use of science to serve society, creatively, constructively, and altruistically in the preservation of life, the production of abundance of goods and services, and the promotion of health and happiness.
- 3—The establishment and furthering of scientific integral education in all schools and colleges so as to emancipate all peoples from the thralldom of ignorance, superstition, prejudices and myths which impede individual development and forestall social progress.
- 4—The widest promotion of the creative arts so as to release all potential artistic abilities and raise the general level of artistic appreciation.
- 5—The increase of social, recreational and travel activities in order to broaden the outlook and improve the intercultural understanding among all peoples.
- 6—A quickened conservation of the world's natural resources, including human resources, so as to arrest their wasteful exhaustion and wanton destruction and thus insure their longest preservation and widest beneficial use for man's survival on this planet.
- 7—The inauguration of a world-wide economy of abundance through national economic planning and international economic cooperation so as to provide a shared plenty for all peoples.
- 8—The advancement of the good life on the basis of a morality determined by historical human experience and contemporary scientific research.
- 9—The development of a coordinated private, cooperative and public medical program which will provide preventive as well as curative medicine and include adequate public health education and personal health counseling.
- 10—The expansion of United Nations functions (1) to include international police power with sufficient armed forces to prevent war and (2) international economic controls capable of preventing world-wide monopolies and/or cartels.

HUMANIST WORLD DIGEST

(Successor to WELCOME NEWS)

A Quarterly of Liberal Religion

Anga Bjornson, Editor. Editorial Associates: Franz Wertgen, Felix J. Frazer, Victor Yarros. Entered as Second-Class matter at the Post Office at Berkeley, California, under the act of March 3, 1879. Publication Committee: Anga Bjornson, chairman; Edward L. Ericson, vice-chairman; John Morris and E. O. Corson, Business Manager. Subscription Rate: \$1.00 per year: Advertising Rates: As space is available, classified ads are 10c a word. Address to Business Manager. Vol. 24, No. 2, April-May-June, 1952. All rights reserved. The Humanist World Digest, 1011 Heinz Ave., Berkeley, Calif.

The responsibility of signed articles in this magazine is accepted by the writers and does not necessarily reflect the views of the Humanist World Digest. Permission granted for reproduction of original articles when proper credit is given.

EDITORIAL

During the past two years there has been a rebirth of democracy in this country. A continuous attack on traditional American freedoms began before the war, gained force and breadth after the war, and is going on with even greater strength at present. But this attack on democracy has brought forth a counter-attack. At every point it is meeting the resistance of an enlightened and vigorous people.

This issue of HWD is a documentation of that resistance. We show how groups with a humanist orientation (although very few would call themselves humanist) are uniting to oppose the attacks whenever they occur. But the resistance movement has more than a negative program. It has found that government of, by and for the people is an exciting and constructive ideal. Just as non-violence is much more than a refusal to take part in violence, so also humanism is more than opposition to inhumanity.

HUMANISTS AND GOD

John H. Dietrich was the first man to use "humanism" to describe his religious attitudes. For forty years, during his career as Unitarian minister and on into his present retirement, Dr. Dietrich has been a spokesman for religious humanism. In fact, the Encyclopedia of Religion calls him the "father" of humanism. No man is better qualified to speak for our group. A recent statement of his will therefore surprise those that equate humanism with atheism.

"I believe in God," Dr. Dietrich said. "I don't use the word very often, because it's so easily misinterpreted, but if I can define the word myself, I believe in God."

Dr. Dietrich was one of a group discussing the meaning of

the word God at the Berkeley Unitarian Church. He spoke briefly (and with a great deal of charm) at the end of the meeting. Others had described their ideas, pro and con, about various kinds of gods; he seemed to draw the pros and the cons together in his description of a poetic interpretation of nature.

The idea is not new. In its beginnings, humanism was not atheism. As early as 1931, Dr. Dietrich was quoted as saying, "Humanism does not exclude the idea of God."

But many debates between humanists and other religious liberals led to an exclusive and negative attitude on the part of some humanists, an attitude that most of us reject. At the same time, the idea of God was undergoing a profound reconstruction at the hands of certain liberal theologians. Thus, while humanism has always rejected the deities of orthodoxy, neo-orthodoxy and fundamentalism, it has grown less and less anxious to reject every possible definition for the three-letter word "God."

We're no longer worried about a word. Theists and atheists can go on debating if they want to, but we're sick and tired of seeing humanists presented as nothing more than a group of anti-godists. We welcome other religious liberals, theist, atheist, and undecided, to join with us in building a life-centered religion. Some day, when we have the leisure, we may work out a solution to the god-problem that will satisfy everybody. Right now the stakes are too high and the time is too short for the godly humanists and the ungodly humanists to be fighting each other.

—J. M.

EDITOR RESIGNS

Shortly before the last issue of HWD was mailed to subscribers, we received the resignation of William E. Zeuch, editor of the magazine. Traveling in South America, he found it impossible to maintain contact with the publication committee in Berkeley. This and future issues of HWD will be edited by members of the publication committee named in the masthead. The Editorial Comments, formerly written by Zeuch, will either be written by the committee as a group or be signed by individual authors.

* * *

"Whatever concerns Humanity is of interest to me"—Terence

THE CRISIS OF CIVILIZATION

By Franz Wertgen

What has brought modern society to its present condition, and what must we do to overcome the crisis of our civilization?

These two questions are uppermost in the minds of all thinking men. But many are the answers, and it seems a hopeless task trying to reconcile the discordant voices, and to work out a common program for all to sponsor. For how are we going to decide, and who is going to decide? The social thinker is in an analogous position with the experimental scientist. Like him, he has his problem, and like him he has to experiment. But he experiments with ideas instead of with things; his field of inquiry is Meanings. Ideas or "Meanings" are abstracts in which experience is expressed, so that the social thinker tests the validity of experience. But experiences differ from age to age and from person to person, therefore the conclusion which men draw from them also differ, and we are apparently where we were before. It is a situation which confounds so many, and discourages them to continue their reach for a solution, that, in the end, they fall back upon ancient beliefs, which relieves them of the necessity to continue their efforts.

Yet there is an answer, and it is given in experience. Moreover, it can actually be tested. But the ever-present difficulty for the social thinker is to retain his objectivity. In this his position differs from that of the scientist. The latter is not emotionally involved in the solution of his problem, except that he is eager to solve it. The social thinker, on the other hand, is too often a partisan, since his own fortunes are bound up with the proposed solution. Nothing demonstrates this more clearly than the present, for we see that the different ideologies are the expression of party interests, be they Communism, Naziism, Socialism, Democracy, Capitalism or what not. But if there is an answer to the social problem, and if it is given in experience, the humanist must find it, for humanism is not a particular faith, doctrine or theory, but a practical approach toward the solution of the social problem.

For this we need a sure foundation, which is the concept of evolution. As testing ground for the validity of experience we have the history of civilization, which shows us what happened, and which enables us to find out why it happened. Yet we must not forget that the past with its traditions, customs, and habits of thought has always ruled the present, and since in a competi-

tive world the new tends to upset the customary, it has been met with hostility. Thus change has been difficult and progress slow. This is inevitably so under competition. For instance, when the German chemist Bayer invented synthetic indigo, the indigo plantagens in India had to go out of business, which meant great distress to tens of thousands of natives. What would happen to the oil industry if a method would be invented which would make it possible to drive machinery with water by decomposing it into its two components, oxygen and hydrogen, using the hydrogen as source of energy? And I know of four claims to make this possible.

If therefore in a competitive society innovations are a danger to the established order, because they threaten the loss of huge aggregations of capital, it is understandable that a change involving the very foundations of society will be resisted all the more fiercely. This is true not only in the field of economics, but also in nearly all other fields, including the sciences. Customs and habits of thought take in modern society the place of taboos of primitive life, or we take for granted what has been handed down to us.

Thus it came about that Darwin formulated his theory of evolution as a struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest. The theory is a theory of method, which must be distinguished from the concept of evolution as such. While the latter is generally accepted today, the former is being disputed more and more. After all, it is a process of elimination which cannot lead to a higher stage of development. Besides, it is evident that there does not exist a struggle for survival between a beast of prey and its prey. If for instance the gazelle could outrun the lion, the latter would have to starve to death; the so-called protective devices do not protect, they are merely logical derivatives from the theory of the survival, and many animals have them which do not need them, such as the crocodile, the tiger, the lion, the elephant, etc. It is even more true of plants. If these could protect themselves against being eaten, the animals living off them would starve; the plants would have to have a seat of consciousness telling them to protect themselves, and how could they generate these devices, how could man grow a protective device; finally, the grasses which are eaten down several times a year insist on growing up again.

Then what induced Darwin to formulate his survival theory? Although he was an innovator he was unconsciously influenced

by two main factors: the increasing competition between the newly arising manufacturers of the industrial revolution, and the philosophic tradition of the dialectic. The dialectic goes back to the early Greek philosophers; it is the expression of the competitive trade society. When therefore the first attempt was made to systematize knowledge, and to give an over-all picture of the universe, this picture took the pattern of the lives of the people, for man always tries to explain the unknown in terms of the known, here his daily struggle. And so, Anaximander, the first philosopher after Thales, with the latter of whom the long series of the early philosophers began, taught that the world took its beginning from two pairs of opposites: hot and dry, and cold and wet. This idea of the development of the universe as a struggle of opposites goes in one form or other through nearly the whole of philosophy. With Karl Marx, who took it over from Hegel, it becomes dialectic materialism or the class struggle.

Today the internal class struggle going on in every nation has grown into an international struggle of two power groups, one supposing to represent the revolutionary workers party, the other the reactionary capitalistic class: Russia and America. And therewith modern civilization has arrived at the final parting of the ways. The alternative is to continue on our way, and to fight a third world war, or to change and to commit ourselves irrevocably to a policy of peace, which means to change from competition to cooperation.

Peace, cooperation and the education of the inner man, these three are the foundations of the ethics of every religion under civilization. The ultimate failure of nearly all civilizations to survive is not due to the fact, as Spengler thought, that they are organisms with a life cycle of their own, but because the evil consequences of competitive endeavor are cumulative: the farther a civilization advances, the greater becomes the gulf between rich and poor. If we learn to distinguish between two main types of civilization, and call them the inland empire, which retains its agricultural basis, and the trade society, which is built on exchange of goods and on profits, we see the corroding influence of competitive endeavor all the more clearly.

Of the two, the former have a greater survival value, because competition is more restraint, but there, too, we see how the peasants are crushed, the soil exhausted, and periodic famines take their toll of life. On the other hand, of the trade societies hardly a trace is left. Since trade means exchange of goods, it

is evident that the more wealth becomes concentrated in the hands of the few, the more the buying power of the masses shrinks. Private competitive trade therefore necessarily digs its own grave.

What I am saying here is not a metaphysics. I am pointing to historical facts. The best illustration is Rome, which developed from an agricultural society into a trade society. Since the aim of competition is to destroy the competitor, Rome more war on the surrounding nations, and when it succeeded in destroying Carthage and Corinth in the same year, 146 B.C., it had gained the monopoly of trade. Then followed the civil war between the agricultural and commercial interests for supremacy. It resulted in the downfall of the Republic, and in the establishment of the autocracy. From then on Rome lived from barefaced robbery, imposing a tribute upon all conquered nations.

These conditions produced two types of revolt: the revolt of the slaves under Spartacus, and when that finally failed, the religious revolt which resulted for the western world in the rise of the Christian religion. The religious revolt which aimed at the core of the evil, at the heart of man, and therefore proclaimed "Peace on Earth, and Good Will Toward Man," demanded thus a reversal in the character of human relationships. But how could this be brought about? The task was immense, for it meant the dissolution of the foundations of the Roman empire. And because it did, the new sect was mercilessly persecuted.

Mutatis mutandis the conditions today are similar. The rivalry between England and Germany led to the first world war, and this to the second one. By joining the allied side America decided the issue in favor of England. But the struggle goes merrily on, it has spread all over the world. The issue is "Freedom."

The attempt of the dictatorships to establish freedom by the use of force may be likened to the Spartacus revolt; it will lead to nothing, except that it will aggravate the existing conditions, for if a third world war should come, there would be little left of Europe, and international trade would be completely paralyzed; a world-wide famine would decimate a great part of the survivors of the war, and utter despair would grip mankind.

All this need not be, if we will only follow the dictates of our religion, and adhere to the democratic principles, which we proclaim to all the world, but do not follow ourselves.

However, it is not enough merely to believe. We must work out a practical system which will embody the democratic prin-

ciples, a system which is not directed "against" a class or nation, but which is positive, and takes into consideration the interests of all. This is the primary task of the new humanism.

To sum up what has been said. The crisis of civilization forces us to look at the foundations upon which society rests. These are the competitive attitude with all its injurious consequences, such as the enslavement of man, the struggle for private wealth and power, which always terminates in an absolutistic regime. This denies the freedom of man, and is therefore the negation of human nature itself. The foundations of the new society therefore must rest upon the opposite principle, the cooperative attitude as proclaimed by all religions, and especially the Christian, and embody the democratic principle of the essential equality of all men.

* * *

FEAR—THE OFFSPRING OF ORTHODOXY

By William O. Douglas

There is an ominous trend in this nation. We are developing tolerance only for the orthodox point of view on world affairs, intolerance for new or different approaches. Orthodoxy normally has stood in the path of change. Orthodoxy was always the stronghold of the status quo, the enemy of new ideas—at least new ideas that were disturbing. He who was wedded to the orthodox view was isolated from the challenge of new facts.

The democratic way of life rejects standardized thought. It rejects orthodoxy. It wants the fullest and freest discussion, within peaceful limits, of all public issues. It encourages constant search for truth at the periphery of knowledge.

We as a people have probably never lived up to that standard in any of our communities. But it has been an ideal toward which most of our communities have strived. We have over the years swung from tolerance to intolerance and back again. There have been eras of intolerance when the views of minorities have been suppressed. But there probably has not been a period of greater intolerance than we witness today.

To understand this, I think one has to leave the country, go into the back regions of the world, lose himself there, and become absorbed in the problems of the people of different civilizations. When he returns to America after a few months he probably will be shocked. He will be shocked not at the intentions or purposes or ideals of the American people. He will be shocked

at the arrogance and intolerance of great segments of the American press, at the arrogance and intolerance of many leaders in public office, at the arrogance and intolerance reflected in many of our attitudes toward Asia. He will find that thought is being standardized, that the permissible area for calm discussion is being narrowed, that the range of ideas is being limited, that many minds are closed to the receipt of any ideas from Asia.

This is alarming to one who loves his country. It means that the philosophy of strength through free speech is being forsaken for the philosophy of fear through repression.

That choice in Russia is conscious. Under Lenin the ministers and officials were encouraged to debate, to advance new ideas and criticisms. Once the debate was over, however, no dissension or disagreement was permitted. But even that small degree of tolerance for free discussion that Lenin permitted disappeared under Stalin. Stalin maintains a tight system of control, permitting no free speech, no real clash in ideas, even in the inner circle. We are, of course, not emulating either Lenin or Stalin. But we are drifting in the direction of repression, drifting dangerously fast.

What is the cause of this drift? What are the forces behind it? It is only a drift, for certainly everything in our tradition would make the great majority of us reject that course as a conscious choice.

The drift goes back, I think, to the fact that we carried over to days of peace the military approach to world affairs. Diplomacy, certainly in our relations with Asia, took a back seat. The military approach conditioned our thinking and our planning. The military, in fact, determined our approach to the Asians and their problems. That has been a great tragedy in Asia. And the tragedy to us at home has been about as great.

Military thinking continued to play a dominant role in our domestic affairs. The conspiratorial role of Soviet communism in the world scene was apparent to all who could read. This conspiratorial role of Soviet communism was, of course, backed by Russia's military strength. We, therefore, had to be strong in a military sense to hold off Russia. But we soon accepted the military role as the dominant one. We thought of Asia in terms of military bases, not in terms of peoples and their aspirations. We wanted the starving people of Asia to choose sides, to make up their minds whether they were for us or against us, to cast their lot with us and against Russia.

We did not realize that to millions of these people the difference between Soviet dictatorship and the dictatorship under which they presently live is not very great. We did not realize that in some regions of Asia it is the Communist party that has identified itself with the so-called reform program, the other parties being mere instruments for keeping a ruling class in power. We did not realize that the choice between democracy and communism is not, in the eyes of millions of illiterates, the critical choice it is for us.

We forgot that democracy in many lands is an empty word; that the appeal is hollow when made to illiterate people living at the subsistence level. We asked them to furnish staging grounds for a military operation whose outcome, in their eyes, had no perceptible relation to their own welfare. Those who rejected our overtures must be Communists, we said. Those who did not fall in with our military plans must be secretly aligning with Russia, we thought. This was the result of our military thinking, of our absorption in military affairs. In Asia it has brought us the lowest prestige in our existence.

The military effort has been involving more and more of our sons, more and more of our budget, more and more of our thinking. The military policy has so completely absorbed our thoughts that we have mostly forgotten that our greatest strength, our enduring power is not in guns, but in ideas. Today in Asia we are identified not with ideas of freedom but with guns. Today at home we are thinking less and less in terms of defeating communism with ideas, more and more in terms of defeating communism with military might.

The concentration on military means has helped to breed fear. It has bred fear and insecurity partly because of the horror of atomic war. But the real reason strikes deeper. In spite of our enormous expenditures, we see that Soviet imperialism continues to expand and that the expansion proceeds without the Soviets firing a shot. The free world continues to contract without a battle for its survival having been fought. It becomes apparent, as country after country falls to Soviet imperialistic ambitions, that military policy alone is a weak one; that military policy alone will end in political bankruptcy and futility. Thus fear mounts.

Fear has many manifestations. The Communist threat inside the country has been magnified and exalted for beyond its realities. Irresponsible talk by irresponsible people has fanned the

flames of fear. Accusations have been loosely made. Character assassinations have become common. Suspicion has taken the place of good-will. Once we could debate with impunity along a wide range of inquiry. Once we could safely explore to the edges of a problem, challenge orthodoxy without qualms, and run the gamut of ideas in search of solutions to perplexing problems. Once we had confidence in each other. Now there is suspicion. Innocent acts become tell-tale marks of disloyalty. The coincidence that an idea parallels Soviet Russia's policy for a moment of time settles an aura of suspicion around a person.

Suspicion grows until only the orthodox idea is the safe one. Suspicion grows until only the person who loudly proclaims that orthodox view, or who, once having been a Communist, has been converted, is trustworthy. Competition for embracing the new orthodoxy increases. Those who are unorthodox are suspect. Everyone who does not follow the military policymakers is suspect. Everyone who voices opposition to the trend away from diplomacy and away from political tactics takes a chance. Some who are opposed are indeed "subversive." Therefore, the thundering edict commands that all who are opposed are "subversive." Fear is fanned to a fury. Good and honest men are pilloried. Character is assassinated. Fear runs rampant.

Fear even strikes at lawyers and the bar. Those accused of illegal Communist activity—all presumed innocent, of course, until found guilty—have difficulty getting reputable lawyers to defend them. Lawyers have talked with me about it. Many are worried. Some could not volunteer their services, for if they did their firms would suffer. Others could not volunteer because if they did they would be dubbed "subversive" by their community and put in the same category as those they would defend. This is a dark tragedy.

Fear has driven more and more men and women in all walks of life either to silence or to the world of the orthodox. Fear has mounted—fear of losing one's job, fear of being investigated, fear of being pilloried. This fear has stereotyped our thinking, narrowed the range of free public discussion, and driven many thoughtful people to despair. This fear has even entered universities, great citadels of our spiritual strength, and corrupted them. We have the spectacle of university officials lending themselves to one of the worst witch hunts we have seen since early days.

This fear has affected the youngsters. Youth has played a very

important role in our national affairs. It has usually been the oncoming generation—full of enthusiasm, full of idealism, full of energy—that has challenged its elders and the status quo. It is from this young group that the country has received much of its moral power. They have always been prone to question the stewardship of their fathers, to doubt the wisdom of traditional practices, to explode clichés, to quarrel with the management of public affairs.

Youth—like the opposition party in a parliamentary system—has served a powerful role. It has cast doubts on our policies, challenged our inarticulate major premises, put the light on our prejudices, and exposed our inconsistencies. Youth has made each generation indulge in self-examination.

But a great change has taken place. Youth is still rebellious; but it is largely holding its tongue. There is the fear of being labeled a "subversive" if one departs from the orthodox party line. That charge—if leveled against a young man or young women—may have profound effects. It may ruin a youngster's business or professional career. No one wants a Communist in his organization nor anyone who is suspect.

And so the lips of the younger generation have become more and more sealed. Repression of ideas has taken the place of debate. There may not be a swelling crowd of converts to the orthodox, military view. But the voice of the opposition is more and more stilled, and youth, the mainstay in early days of the revolt against orthodoxy, is largely immobilized.

This pattern of orthodoxy that is shaping our thinking has dangerous implications. No one man, no one group can have the answer to the many perplexing problems that today confront the management of world affairs. The scene is a troubled and complicated one. The problems require the pooling of many ideas, the exposure of different points of view, the hammering out in public discussions of the pros and cons of this policy or of that.

There are few who know first hand the conditions in the villages of Asia, the South Pacific, South America, and Africa. There are few who really know the powerful forces operating from the grass roots in those areas—forces that are reflected in the attitudes of the men who head up the Governments in those countries. But unless we know those attitudes, we cannot manage intelligently. Unless we know, we will waste our energies and our resources. Unless we know, we are not in position to win

even political alliances of an enduring nature. Unless we are eager to know, unless we invite a flood of information on these problems, unless we encourage every avenue of approach to them, we will live and act in ignorance.

There are those who think that our present policy toward Asia will lead to disaster—for us. There are those who believe that in Asia we are fast becoming the symbol of what the people of Asia fear and hate. There are those who believe that the most effective bases we can get in Asia are bases in the hearts of Asia's millions, not bases on their lands. There are those who believe that we must substitute a political for a military strategy in Asia; that when there is a cease-fire in Korea, we must make a political settlement with Red China; that if we apply to China the attitude we are now brilliantly exploiting in Yugoslavia, we can manage to make Soviet imperialism crumble.

There are those who are deeply opposed, many of whom put that issue beyond the pale of discussion. There are even some who make the crucial test of one's loyalty or sanity his acceptance or rejection of our present policy toward Asia.

The question of our Asian policy illustrates the need for a wide range of free public discussion. Asia poses probably the most critical issues of the day. Certain it is that if Asia, like China, is swept into the political orbit of Soviet Russia the Soviets will then command or be able to immobilize

—the bulk of the people of the world

—the bulk of the wealth of the world.

If that happens, it is doubtful if we, with all our atomic bombs, could even win a war.

The great danger of this period is not inflation, nor the national debt, nor atomic warfare. The great, the critical danger is that we will so limit or narrow the range of permissible discussion and permissible thought that we will become victims of the orthodox school. If we do, we will lose flexibility. We will lose the capacity for expert management. We will then become wedded to a few techniques, to a few devices. They will define our policy and at the same time limit our ability to alter or modify it. Once we narrow the range of thought and discussion, we will surrender a great deal of our power. We will become like the man on the toboggan who can ride it but who can neither steer it nor stop it.

The mind of man must always be free. The strong society is one that sanctions and encourages freedom of thought and ex-

pression. When there is that freedom, a nation has resiliency and adaptability. When freedom of expression is supreme, a nation will keep its balance and stability.

Our real power is our spiritual strength, and that spiritual strength stems from our civil liberties. If we are true to our traditions, if we are tolerant of a whole market place of ideas, we will always be strong. Our weakness grows when we become intolerant of opposing ideas, depart from our standards of civil liberties, and borrow the policeman's philosophy from the enemy we detest.

That has been the direction of our drift. It is dangerous to the morale of our people; it is destructive of the influence and prestige of our country. The demands of orthodoxy already have begun to sap our strength—and to deprive us of power. One sees it from far-off Asia. From Asia one sees an America that is losing its humanity, its idealism, and its Christian character. From Asia one sees an America that is strong and rich and powerful, and yet crippled and ineffective because of its limited vision.

When we view this problem full face we are following the American tradition. The times demand a renaissance in freedom of thought and freedom of expression, a renaissance that will end the orthodoxy that threatens to devitalize us.

* * *

THE PEOPLE TALK BACK

By John Morris

The time was five o'clock. Time for radio's "children's hour," an hour of violence, blood and thunder, thickly interspersed with breakfast food advertisements. And the kiddies came running to the radio. But I was in for a surprise.

The children's hour began with singing, led by a pleasant-voiced young woman accompanying herself on the guitar. The four children that I was visiting joined in lustily on the choruses, not only with their voices but with instruments of their own: a milk bottle, an oatmeal box and a tin can each fitted with a few small stones inside; together with a grater along which the three-year-old was scraping a stick, these made up their "kitchen orchestra."

There was a quarter-hour of what might loosely be termed music; then came a reading from Kenneth Grahame's "The Wind in the Willows." Both the children and I were familiar with and delighted by Mr. Toad's masquerade as a washer-woman.

Fifteen minutes of recorded music followed the story. An informal talk about the curious habits of local snakes came next. Authentic and accurate, given by the Naturalist for the local parks, the talk was pitched at kid-level, and the kids were fascinated.

At six o'clock (or rather 6:08; the schedules are never allowed to interfere with the programs) the adult programs began. Two of the older children stayed for a while to listen to the First Concert, and hour and a half of recorded music, while the other two ran off singing and playing on their home-made instruments.

This was my introduction to the most exciting experiment in contemporary radio. The station KPFA represents several hundred radio listeners who are doing what commercial radio won't do for them. They are attempting to meet one of the greatest problems of our time—the problem of communications.

The problem is highly complex and is well enough known to HWD readers not to need great elaboration here. A quotation from "TV Magazine" will serve to show at least that a problem exists:

"One hundred and twenty-seven murders, 101 "justifiable killings," 357 attempted murders, 93 kidnappings, 11 jailbreaks, three brandings of men with hot irons—these figures represent crimes committed in one week on television programs in Los Angeles. **Seventy-two per cent of the crimes occurred on programs designed especially for children.**"

Reactions to this kind of "entertainment" have been varied. Some, probably the majority of TV set owners, enjoy it. Others attempt to ignore it. But there is also a vigorous and vocal opposition to the garishness, stupidity and violence of some of the most popular TV programs.

One proposed solution is Sen. William Benton's National Citizen's Advisory Board on Radio and Television. Still in committee, the proposal is strongly opposed by many industrial groups as "contrary to American principles of freedom." Speaking in a committee hearing for the network that bears his name, Dr. Du Mont described a stern new code recently adopted by broadcasters.

"We shall be guided by principles of programming which will make our programs acceptable and satisfying to families," he said. Programs for children are designed "to encourage a healthy orientation for a child to his social surroundings and develop a respect for his parents." The Du Mont network plans "to raise

and never lower the educational, moral, cultural, political and entertainment standards of the average home."

Because of the phenomenal spread of television during the past five years and because an even greater expansion of telecast facilities is now waiting for federal approval, it is certainly time that the industry took some notice of the social role it plays. Whether through an Advisory Board or a broadcasters code, the most pressing demands of the consumer will be brought forcefully to the attention of the producer. Will this mean more mature radio and television programming?

Many believe that commercial broadcasting will not become more mature. They find—and here we are at the heart of the communications problem—that mass salesmanship and mature, artistic communication will not mix. The whole purpose and reason for being of a commercial broadcast is to sell something—breakfast food, tooth paste or an enlistment in the army—and everything must therefore be subordinated to the salesman. In fact, commercial programs are run by advertising agencies, not independent producers. This means that if excited people buy more breakfast food, we'll have violence, hatred, sex, noise and whatnot to get them excited. That this artificially-induced excitement might bring on a disintegration of personality, as well as play havoc with a sense of values, is not taken into consideration. It cannot be, because it means the difference between selling and not selling, and programs that don't sell don't stay on the air.

If this analysis is anywhere near the truth, the answer to the communications problem must lie in some form of non-commercial operation, some way of escaping from the control of the advertiser. In practice, this has meant financing of the station by unions, by schools or colleges, or by the listeners themselves.

KPFA is an example—the only example—of the last. It represents a group of people that want intelligent radio programs, and feel that the way to get them is through the system they call "listener sponsorship." The station's operation is designed to be paid for by the listeners themselves, rather than by commercial advertisers. Because the station is acting as a pilot project, showing what can be done not only in FM radio but in other communications areas, it deserves study and support.

There is no room here to do justice to the range of KPFA's schedule. I might say that it is not simply a plan for broadcasting classical records, although it does run upwards of three

hours a day of serious music, as well as folk music and a series on jazz. Discussions (where the subjects range from current affairs to religious beliefs), commentary, drama, poetry, literature, music, children's programs—these make up the station's activities. And most of these show a great deal more ambition than might be expected. For instance, the program I'm listening to now might simply have been a classical disk-jockey show; instead it's a "live" concert of modern music broadcast from the San Francisco Museum of Art.

The station requires about 4000 subscribers to become self-supporting, two per cent of its potential listening audience. Theoretically, a similar station could be developed in any community with a population as large as that of the San Francisco Bay region. A listener-sponsored radio station might, however, be developed in a much smaller community if its programming were less ambitious than that of KPFA.

How would the plan work in other communications areas? Commercial radio, depending entirely on advertising revenue, is most in need of some way to escape from advertiser control, and it is here that non-commercial operation can offer the most striking results. Television, equally in need of reform, is probably much too expensive and unrewarding a medium to respond to consumer control.

Motion pictures, again, are too expensive to be produced by consumer groups. On the other hand, groups for exhibiting films have been very successful. During the past few years, film study groups have been discovering some of the rare and unusual productions that never reach commercial movie houses.

Newspaper and magazine publishing deserve consideration, although the conspicuous failures of such enterprises as the newspaper PM and '48, the Magazine of the Year, indicate the risks involved. Probably we ought to concentrate on low-outlay news sheets, mimeographed or cheaply printed. Cooperative book buying is another plan that has been successful.

But the major solution to the communications problem will be found in a method that is distinctively different from the mass-communications media which are tyrannical in their very structure. The owning group acts as tyrant, pouring forth its message to the passive recipients who form the audience. Our suggested solution has been one of giving these recipients something to say, something to do. To be democratic, communication must travel in both directions. Our aim will be to restore

democratic give-and-take to communications, and this can most easily be done when the communicants are face to face. We ought to get people to talk to each other. This means organizing discussion and study groups, and learning the techniques for making those groups work. It means organizing churches, and seeing to it that those churches do more than meet to listen to a sermon. It means meeting people and talking with them. It means turning off the television set when friends come by to visit. None of these activities require much of a monetary outlay, if any at all.

The communications problem has been growing from the time of the scurrilous newspaper attacks on Thomas Jefferson to the scientific mass propaganda of our own times. Through cooperation we are meeting that problem.

(For more information about KPFA and listener sponsorship, write to the station at 2207 Shattuck, Berkeley 4, Calif.

(One of the best sources of motion pictures for non-profit study groups is the Museum of Modern Art in New York.

(For information about cooperative book buying, write Books Unlimited, Box 775, Berkeley, Calif.

(Finally, HWD itself will be glad to furnish aid and advice about starting local religious groups. Write Humanist World Digest, 1011 Heinz Avenue, Berkeley, Calif. Phone THornwall 3-1632.)

* * *

THE FREE CHURCH AND DEMOCRACY

By Phyllis Martin

I have before me two leaflets that I found in the literature racks of the local Methodist Church. Both of them are issued by that church's Commission on World Peace. "Challenge to Peacemaking," one of the leaflets, is a challenge also to the worn-out notion that a church must think only in terms of prayers and supernatural formulas.

The challenge is presented in terms of concrete and effective action, such as: "Be a witness for peace, not only in formal gatherings, but also in casual conversation and in correspondence. It is often helpful to write to officials of government and of the press, but it is also important to speak for peace in letters to friends and acquaintances . . . Be informed. Materials of daily newspapers and radio commentators should be checked and supplemented by reference to magazines, books, and other sources . . ." Even the last point is interesting: "Be prayerful. We can do more than pray after we have prayed, but we cannot do more than pray until we have prayed."

The Methodists are certainly not the only religious group with a concern for peace. The soundest approach to the problem of securing peace is that presented in the Quaker pamphlet, "Steps to Peace," and their earlier report, "The U. S. and the Soviet Union."

Force Behind Democracy

We are rediscovering the close connections between certain religious groups and the democratic tradition. We are finding that the driving force behind democracy is essentially a religious force. We like to call that force "humanism," but the name doesn't matter a great deal.

Modern historical scholarship has shown that the roots of free religion go back much farther and are much more deeply imbedded in Western culture than many of us suspect. We used to think of Martin Luther as beginning the Reformation, as the first to revolt against the Catholic hierarchy. We now see that the Protestantism of Luther and Calvin represents only the right wing of a much larger movement which had spread widely among the peasants of Central Europe, France and England. The Protestantism of Luther and Calvin was an upper class movement, representing the nobility in revolt against the Pope and the Church, but still anxious to retain their own aristocratic control. Hidden from sight, but below and supporting the church of the princes, was a tremendous lower-class movement, the Left Wing of the Reformation.

High Church Reaction

This peasant church was mercilessly suppressed by both the Catholics and the right wing Protestants. Completely illiterate, it left almost no written records. Historians often underestimated its importance. The lower-class church was nevertheless one of the most powerful forces in building the democratic tradition.

The Anabaptists, Waldensians and Hussites in Europe and the Lollards in England provoked the same stern response from the ruling powers. Even when the left-wing churches were not wiped out, they were forced to meet in secret and were unable to take part in government. With the arrival of the Pilgrims in America, the picture changed. Minority religious groups fleeing to this country escaped much of the suppression they had felt in Europe, and they were able to write their ideas into law. The Mayflower Compact was the first of such documents. Many others followed and provided the basis out of which the Constitution was finally to arise.

Down With Priestcraft

What was the democratic ideal that these early free churches set forth? They put it this way: "Each man his own priest." There was to be no hierarchy standing between man and his religious experience. Each person was to interpret the Gospels himself without the self-regarding falsifications of the priests. And if men needed no religious aristocracy, what need was there for kings and nobles? Free religion became outspokenly democratic. In speaking for the rights of oppressed peasants, in holding up the ideal of the kingdom of love, in seeking to support the rights of men, free religion was developing the characteristics of modern humanism.

The democratic ideal has underlain American religion in spite of the development of aristocratic trappings in some American churches. This democratic tradition has even succeeded in transforming, to a certain extent, the behavior of such anti-democratic importations as the Catholic Church. If the American Catholics were not so completely tied to Rome, we might have developed an independent American church by 1900. With anti-Roman feeling growing among American Catholics, there is again the possibility of a break away from Rome.

Destroying Racial Lines

The democratic ideal shows through in many of the indigenous American cults, as for instance, Father Divine's group. According to the description of the cult in C. S. Braden's book, *These Also Believe*, it has many bizarre ideas. Not the least of these is the notion that its leader is an incarnation of God, or that asceticism is a high moral goal. On the other hand, the group preaches a total destruction of the lines that divide racial groups. There are no such things as races. It is particularly interesting that Father Divine connects racial equality correctly with Americanism, implicitly denying the popular modern notion that equality is un-American. Also interesting is the group's pacifism—a characteristic more typical of the left-wing Reformation groups than of their modern offspring.

Unlike Father Divine's group, however, many of the American cults described in Braden's book are distinctly non-democratic, and two of the 13 show some of the characteristics of fascism.

Opposing UMT

The role of many American churches has been distinctively on the side of democracy. This humanistic influence showed through clearly in the recent Congressional battle over UMT. Of all the American groups that united to secure at least a temporary defeat of that nightmare, none was more vocal than the churches. And no group was more active in seeing that its members recorded their opposition in Washington. The avalanche of letters that preceded UMT's defeat may be credited in large measure to the churches.

Several months ago the Council of Bishops of the Methodist Church reaffirmed its opposition to UMT, and the Maine Council of Churches passed a unanimous resolution to that effect. At about the same time, 84 Protestant clergymen representing 15 major denominations in Western New York took a strong stand against UMT.

Democracy in the Church

A stand against tyranny is natural for free churches. They themselves have succeeded in overcoming tyranny within religion itself. Free church structure is often highly democratic, the members of the congregations electing the leaders and determining the policies of the group. Creeds rarely appear in the free church, and when they do, they are understood as tools for reaching truth rather than ultimate truth in themselves. The free church does not force conformity upon its members, because it recognizes that enforced conformity is the denial of democracy. The free church is, in short, a democratic society in itself.

Because the church forms a society with a certain degree of independence from the state, it stands in a unique relationship to the state. No institution is in a better position to recognize and attack governmental tyranny. No other institution to the same degree stands outside the state and at the same time within it. Although few churches are aware of the tremendous responsibility involved, there are a few, the free churches, that stand for the rights of the people as against the power of the state. To this extent, our free churches are the guardians of our democracy.

* * *

MAYBE YOU WILL WANT TO GO
FIRST INTERNATIONAL CONGRESS ON
HUMANISM AND ETHICAL CULTURE
Amsterdam - August 21st to 26th, 1952

PROBLEMS OF COOPERATIVE FARMING IN THE FAR EAST

By Sir Roger Thomas, C.I.E., Karachi, Pakistan

The following statement was contributed by Sir Roger Thomas to the discussion on cooperative farming at the Commonwealth Conference on Agricultural Cooperation, held at Oxford, England, from July 23rd to 27th, 1951. This statement assumes particular interest in view of the official position of its author as Agricultural Adviser to the Government of Sind, a Province of Pakistan. It is offered here essentially in the form in which it was read at the Conference, omitting merely an appended proposal that a "comprehensive account of the different systems of Cooperative Farming adopted in all countries should be compiled and published for the information and guidance of all those interested in increasing agricultural production, particularly in over-populated countries."—The Editor.

The prevailing conditions common to vast areas in the Far East include:

1. Exceedingly small peasant holdings, mostly below two acres and often fragmented.
2. Heavy pressure of population on the land and considerable underemployment. (In Bengal the density of the rural population is about 800 per square mile).
3. Primitive and very low standards of farming technique, with consequent low productivity of the land.
4. Extreme poverty and very low standards of living amongst the rural masses, with much malnutrition.
5. Low creditworthiness of the peasants.
6. Laws of inheritance which permit subdivision of holdings.
7. A precarious rainfall.
8. A high birth rate.

To improve the lot of people living under the conditions constitutes a challenge to the Cooperative Movement. There is no denying that the Movement can be of very substantial aid in attaining this objective, but we are primarily concerned in this discussion with Cooperative Farming.

One of the World's greatest and gravest problems today, a problem which promises to be an annual recurring one, is firstly, how to feed and then, how to raise the standard of living of the hungry millions in the overpopulated regions of the East. The empty bellies in these countries result in the main from the pressure of population on the land coupled with the present low

productivity of the land, a productivity which is very substantially below its potential. It is, in particular, with the attainment of the productive potential on these lands that I am here mainly concerned.

No avenue which promises a solution, in however small part, to this colossal problem should be left unexplored. There are some reasons for believing that Cooperative Farming, in various forms best suited to local conditions, may prove to be a profitable avenue of approach in raising the productivity of these lands and thereby aid towards attaining the objective of national self-sufficiency in human foodstuffs.

There has been, during the past decade or so, an increasing consciousness amongst Administrators and Politicians of the terrible prospect of widespread famines of which Economists had much earlier given due warning. The progressive annual increase in the population of these countries is far in excess of the increase in the productivity of the land. The present rate of increase in growth of populations in some Eastern Countries is such as to pave the way for widespread and annually recurring famines. There is neither food enough nor work enough for the people. The land-labor ratio is deteriorating with ever-increasing tempo.

To eliminate the national deficiencies in foodstuffs calls for a more dynamic approach to the problem of increasing crop production in these countries than any measure hitherto adopted. The rural masses can be very incendiary material; and empty bellies provide a medium on which Communism thrives.

What the repercussions of the prospective famines may be on world economy, on world politics, and on the preservation of the democratic way of life is not for me to predict. And yet, the writing on the wall in China, Iran and elsewhere is abundantly clear. It is doubtful whether the national economy of any of the overpopulated countries of the East can indefinitely bear the drain and strain imposed by ever-increasing imports of food grains. There is no "Open Sesame" to solve the prospective famine problems; but increasing the productivity of the land in the regions concerned should unquestionably be given priority over all other preventive measures.

What help can Cooperative Farming give toward this end?

The land-labor ratio covering wide areas in the Far East is deteriorating so fast that it will be fateful to remain inactive while waiting for the impending deluge. Though urgency is of the very essence of the problem, we yet have to tread warily in adopting

any unproved system of Cooperative Farming. We cannot risk failures. Wrong measures can be adopted only at the peril of disaster which may prove irretrievable.

There has, in the past, been too much complacency in the matter of adopting famine preventive measures designed to make these countries self-sufficient in foodstuffs. The Colombo Plan, Truman's Point Four, and the other financial aids, though helpful, will touch only the fringe of the problem. Of late, there has been much loose talk in some countries of the East about Cooperative Farming as a solution to many agrarian ills; but very little has yet been offered by way of concrete schemes which will remove the ills in overpopulated regions without creating bigger ills.

I have been at some pains to collect information concerning Cooperative Farming in different countries, and except for Collective Farming in Russia, I have been disappointed with the paucity of published literature on this subject. There are, admittedly, some notable achievements in Cooperative Farming of which the Israel schemes are an example. Then there are the Sudan and French Niger large scale land colonization and development schemes, under irrigated conditions, which, though not orthodox Cooperative, do have elements of cooperation with remarkably successful results under the local conditions of sparse rural population and economic holdings.

Cooperative Farms on a comparatively small scale, and most of them still in the experimental stage, are to be found in most countries, but nowhere do we find models of Cooperative Farming suited to the overpopulated countries of the East.

What has Cooperative Farming to offer to overpopulated lands? If it can—in any guise, whether on a voluntary basis or with compulsion, and whether State aided or otherwise—help in attaining the objectives of increasing agricultural production in overpopulated lands and of raising the standard of living of the people on these lands, then assuredly Cooperative Farming should be undertaken. But let us not underestimate the practical difficulties and the obstacles to success. These are manifold, and some of them are of such magnitude as to offer little, if any, hope of surmounting. The pitfalls are many and some of them appear to be fathomless. Yet these should not deter us from fully exploring this promising avenue of approach to the paramount problem of increasing agricultural production in the threatened countries. This transcends all other measures to stave off famines.

—Reprint Cooperative Living

THE STATE OF LIBERTY

By Edward L. Ericson

DISSENT ON THOUGHT CONTROL

William O. Douglas and Hugo Black continue to write dissenting opinions which are destined to be remembered among the greatest in American constitutional history. The last occasion of note came on March 4 when the high court upheld the constitutionality of the New York Feinburg Law.

"Any organization committed to a liberal cause, any group organized to revolt against a historical trend, any committee launched to sponsor an unpopular program, becomes suspect," wrote Justice Douglas.

"The present law," he continued, "proceeds on a principle repugnant to our society—guilt by association . . . The law inevitably turns the school system into a spying project."

Justice Black called it "another of those rapidly multiplying legislative enactments which make it dangerous . . . to think or say anything except what a transient majority happens to approve at the moment . . . Police officials with such powers are not public servants; they are public masters."

Nevertheless, the Feinburg Law was upheld 5 to 3, with Frankfurter joining the dissenters on a technicality. Only one Roosevelt appointee voted to uphold the constitutionality of the law. Four Truman appointees ruled in its favor.

Loyalty Oath Hurts Pennsylvania

The rash of loyalty oath legislation continues to spread. From Pennsylvania comes news that the Pechan Loyalty Oath Act, after one month of operation, has cost the state the services of two Quaker school teachers, a Quaker social worker, eight doctors and a nurse.

In addition, ten candidates, representing minor parties, have been barred from the ballot because their nomination papers were not accompanied by the required oath. The candidates represented the Prohibition Party, the Militant Workers, the Industrial Government, and the Independent Citizens ticket.

One of the dismissed teachers, 27-year-old Paul W. Goulding, charged that the oath is "one of several instruments by which we are being 'persuaded' that totalitarian regimentation must be met by totalitarian, 100 per cent, 'Americanism'."

Goulding, together with two others, is being defended by the Philadelphia branch of the American Civil Liberties Union.

Meanwhile, noting that the oath has not revealed subversion, but continues to injure those who cannot sign on religious grounds or on grounds of principle, liberal and labor groups are organizing themselves for its repeal.

Pacifists Jailed on Charge of Advocating Violence

Pacifists in jail are not unfamiliar. But this is a new angle:

Ruth Reynolds, well-known American pacifist and advocate of Puerto Rican independence, has received a six-year sentence for "advocating the overthrow of the Government by force and violence."

Convicted on evidence called "flimsy" by Fellowship magazine, she was charged with taking an oath to give "life and fortune to insure the overthrowing, paralyzing, and subverting of the Insular Government." This, pointed out Miss Reynolds' supporters, was a distortion, since the oath in question pledged one to give life and fortune to the cause of Puerto Rican independence. Miss Reynolds denies taking the oath. The remaining evidence consists of allegedly riding in a car which carried arms before the violence of October, 1950.

Her case is being appealed by the Free Speech Committee of the American Civil Liberties Union.

California Teacher Defended by Profession

Teachers who espouse liberal causes continue to be harassed by character assassins. Some of the more fortunate ones are being defended by their professional organizations.

A young social studies teacher in San Lorenzo, California, Miss Fern Bruner, sponsored a student chapter of the United World Federalists. Last September, radio commentator Jimmy Tarantino called her "a Communist, or a Communist sympathizer . . . a leader of the phoney World Federalist organization."

An official investigation by the California Teachers Association established that the charges against Miss Bruner and the World Federalists were groundless, and their investigating commission has called for legal action against Tarantino to prevent "similar future attacks on members of the profession."

Militarist Inroads in Education

Our public schools are faced by another onslaught from the militarists. The latest campaign is designed to indoctrinate high school students for the acceptance of permanent conscription.

The medium is a series of films prepared by Coronet magazine

in cooperation with the Defense Department titled "Are You Ready for Service?" The avowed aim, according to Coronet, is to furnish students with a "new principle" to replace the "out-moded" concept that "peace is basic." Coronet complains that youth have been taught to abhor violence and value "getting along with others."

Church groups and religious organizations have alerted their members to be on the lookout for the introduction of this propaganda in their local schools.

Point Four Makes Gigantic Sweatshops

The Point Four program may turn the backward areas of the world into "gigantic sweatshops," warned Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas in a recent address before the National Conference on International and Social Development.

Unless freedom for colonial people is written into the program, it will become "a monstrosity," insisted the jurist, who has made travel and study of the East his principle avocation between sessions of the high court. Until modified, he contended, it will benefit only a handful of wealthy landlords.

"In most of Asia you have the conditions of feudalism, of filth and hunger that you had in Europe 900 years ago. When you talk to any American who wants to stabilize that situation, you are talking to the most dangerous man in the world today.

"You can't stabilize feudalism and expect to survive. It can't be done with all the wealth of America. With all the atomic bombs of America it can't be done.

"We in America have great technical skills, but I hate to think to think that America will go down in history as the nation that made the first atomic bomb, the bathroom, the television set and the fastest car. Surely America should be remembered for something greater than that. I believe the thing we've got in America is what we wrote in the Declaration of Independence—something we wrote not only for ourselves but for all peoples."

He proposed a "Point Five" program to "extend the American revolution of social justice" to underdeveloped areas by providing the peasants with the right to vote and the right to own land.

Before helping any country with Point Four assistance, said Douglas, the people of the United States must make a decision: "Who are you for, the peasants or the landowners? Do we Americans believe in the righteousness of power or the power of right?"

LETTERS TO EDITOR

What Is Religion?

To the Editor:

I do not know of any way to convince them that you are a religious organization except to define religion and show that your organization is devoted entirely to its realization. Of course, the old dictionaries define religion as the relation between human and superhuman beings; but the definition has undergone a great change in recent years because of the scientific study of the origin and nature of religions. Hence the New American Dictionary—the most recent and considered the most authoritative—gives as the primary definition the following:

"The quest for the value of the ideal life, involving three phases: the ideal, the practices for attaining the value of the ideal, and the world view relating the quest to the environing universe." Its second definition is "A particular system in which the quest for the ideal life has been embodied."

Other definitions are:

William James: "A man's reaction upon life."

A. E. Haydon: "The cooperative quest for the good life."

E. S. Ames: "The consciousness of the highest social values."

John Dewey: "The allegiance to an ideal."

Julian Huxley: "The sense of sacredness."

R. W. Sellars: "Loyalty to the thing one values."

To me, religion is loyalty and consecration to the highest ethical values which one can conceive. The important thing is that religion is an attitude regardless of the object toward which the attitude is held. The object may be God, but it may also be the realization of a good life in a good world. So I would define religion as the human effort to realize the ideal; the attempt to ameliorate the conditions of our earthly existence; the yearning for a richer experience, a nobler life, along with the constructive effort to achieve such a life.

And a religious organization is simply an organization to help people practice this kind of religion. It is a place of meditation on the great mystery of existence, where the natural and healthy emotions of awe and wonder find expression, where the highest human ideals may be consistently held before their eyes, and where people may obtain genuine guidance in the pursuit of those ideals.

In the above sense, and that is the sense of all religious scholars today, our group should classify as a religious organization, as Humanist groups do in other cities in various parts of the country. In other words, Humanism has been recognized as a religion; and if the man who makes the decision lives in the present and not in the past he will recognize this fact.

Berkeley, California.

—John H. Dietrich

Redefining Old Terms

To the Editor:

I like the editorial comment in the issue of November, 1951. Many secularists and others seem unable to appreciate the fact that many words have meanings very different from their original meanings; that words can be redefined; that dictionaries can be changed.

—J. M. S.

Illinois.

Getting Acquainted

To the Editor:

If you have other subscribers, or know of any Humanists in Washington, I would appreciate very much to learn their names and addresses, so we may get together with them.

—Irving A. Zaret

2833 - 28th St., S. E., Washington 20, D. C.

Door to the Future

To the Editor:

Allow me to offer my highest praise for the fine articles and editorials of recent issues. I like your shrewd and penetrating comment on current issues. Also, I share your feeling that the Humanist concept and creed is due for a great emergence in the general consciousness as the door to the better future we all seek.

Los Angeles.

—H. P.

* * *

The plant is an animal confined in a wooden case; and Nature, like Sycorax, holds thousands of "delicate Ariels" imprisoned in every oak. She is jealous of letting us know this; and among the higher and more conspicuous forms of plants reveals it only by such obscure manifestations as the shrinking of the Sensitive Plant, the sudden clasp of the Dionea, or still more slightly, by the phenomena of the cyclosis.—Huxley.

Selfishness is not living as one wishes to live; it is asking others to live as one wishes to live. And unselfishness is letting other people's lives alone, not interfering with them. Selfishness always aims at creating around it an absolute uniformity of type. Unselfishness recognizes infinite variety of type as a delightful thing, accepts it, acquiesces in it, enjoys it.—Oscar Wilde.

* * *

MANAGING EDITOR'S COLUMN

We have added a "Letters to the Editor" column, as the HWD believes that close correspondence between editor and reader is not only necessary, but that will greatly increase the interest of the readers in the general policy and objectives of the magazine.

We want to encourage reader expression.

Outside of our regular subscribers those who receive a copy of the magazine and have not subscribed means that someone has suggested we send you a sample copy. If you have not paid for a subscription and like the magazine just fill out the following application blank, clip a dollar bill to it and send it along for a year's subscription.

SUBSCRIPTION FORM

Please enter my subscription to the Humanist World Digest for
.....years at \$1.00 per year. \$..... enclosed herewith.

Please send information on how to become a member or form
a chapter of the Humanist (World) Fellowship.....(Check)

NAME

ADDRESS

(Please type or print)

Add additional names on a separate sheet.

Mail to: **HUMANIST WORLD DIGEST**

P. O. Box 75

Berkeley 4, California

INTERPRETING HUMANIST OBJECTIVES

HUMANIST FELLOWSHIP is a religious association incorporated under the laws of the State of California with all the rights and privileges of such organizations. It enrolls members, charters local societies, affiliates like-minded groups, establishes educational projects and ordains ministers.

HUMANIST FELLOWSHIP defines religions in terms of two inseparable historical processes: (1) the ages-long quest for ultimate human values; and (2) the continuous effort to realize these values in individual experience and in just and harmonious social relations. Humanism affirms the inviolable dignity of the individual and declares democracy the only acceptable method of social progress.

MODERN HUMANISM seeks to unite the whole of mankind in ultimate religious fellowship. It strives for the integration of the whole personality and the perfection of social relationships as the objectives of religious effort. Humanism, in broad terms, tries to achieve a good life in a good world. **HUMANIST FELLOWSHIP** is a shared quest for that good life.

Above all, man is not to be regarded as an instrument that serves and glorifies totalitarianism — economic, political or ecclesiastical.

HUMANISM insists that man is the highest product of the creative process within our knowledge, and as such commands our highest allegiance. He is the center of our concern. He is not to be treated as a means to some other end, but as an end in himself. Heretofore man has been considered a means to further the purposes of gods, states, economic systems, social organizations; but Humanism would reverse this and make all these things subservient to the fullest development of the potentialities of human nature as the supreme end of all endeavor. This is the cornerstone of Humanism, which judges all institutions according to their contribution to human life.

HUMANISM recognizes that all mankind are brothers with a common origin. We are all of one blood with common interests and a common life and should march with mutual purposes toward a common goal. This means that we must eradi-

cate racial antagonisms, national jealousies, class struggles, religious prejudices and individual hatreds. Human solidarity requires that each person consider himself a cooperating part of the whole human race striving toward a commonwealth of man built upon the principles of justice, good will and service.

HUMANISM seeks to understand human experience by means of human inquiry. Despite the claims of revealed religions, all of the real knowledge acquired by the race stems from human inquiry. Humanists investigate facts and experience, verify these, and formulate thought accordingly. However, nothing that is human is foreign to the Humanist. Intuitions, speculations, supposed supernatural revelations are all products of some human mind so must be understood and evaluated. The whole body of our culture — art, poetry, literature, music, philosophy and science must be studied and appreciated in order to be understood and appraised.

HUMANISM has no blind faith in the perfectibility of man but assumes that his present condition, as an individual and as a member of society, can be vastly improved. It recognizes the limitations of human nature but insists upon developing man's natural talents to their highest point. It asserts that man's environment, within certain limits, can be arranged so as to enhance his development. Environment should be brought to bear on our society so as to help to produce healthy, sane, creative, happy individuals in a social structure that offers the most opportunity for living a free and full life.

HUMANISM accepts the responsibility for the conditions of human life and relies entirely upon human efforts for their improvement. Man has made his own history and he will create his own future—for good or ill. The Humanist determines to make this world a fit place to live in and human life worth living. This is a hard but challenging task. It could result gloriously.

These brief paragraphs indicate the objectives and methods of **HUMANIST FELLOWSHIP** as a religious association. Upon the basis of such a program it invites all like-minded people into membership and communion. Let us go forward together.



Josiah R. Bartlett
2443 LeConte Ave.
Berkeley 9, Calif. (e)